<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-43 are pending. Claim 44 has been cancelled. Reconsideration is requested.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-31 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Allen et al. Allen et al disclose a system for distributing compressed video data (see FIG. 3 blocks 308, 310, 312 and column 15, lines 21-34). The present invention is expressly directed to the transmission of "uncompressed" media specifically including uncompressed video across a data network. The relative disadvantages of compressing video for transmission across a data network are addressed by Applicant at page 1, lines 25 to page 2, line 2 of the present specification. Applicant has described a unique system that utilizes real time video predictive coding to obviate all forms of data truncation and avoid the noted disadvantages of compression. Applicant has amended the pending claims to more explicitly recite a system and related method for transmission of an "uncompressed" multimedia stream over a network. Allen et al clearly does not anticipate the pending claims. This rejection should therefore now be withdrawn.

Claims 32-43 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Allen et al in view of Zhang et al. Zhang et al disclose channel allocation priority in the form of a bit rate converter which adjusts bandwidth per video stream to increase or decrease compression ratio to reflect priority. Thus Zhang et al specifically deal with compressed video for their channel allocation priority. Applicant expressly

AMENDMENT Continued Serial No. 09/761,114

claims a network transmission system for "uncompressed" video. Applicant's claimed channel allocation priority is always full bandwidth for video data or none at all. Thus, Zhang et al does not and cannot serve to add channel allocation priority for Allen et al in a system expressly designed for the transmission of uncompressed video. Accordingly, the combined teaching of Allen et al and Zhang et al does not apply to claims 32-43 and the rejection should also be withdrawn.

It should be noted that Applicant has amended claim 2 to obviate an objection based on improper dependent form.

In view of the above-noted amendments and remarks, an early allowance of pending claims 1-43 appears to be merited and such is earnestly solicited.

espectfully submitted

Leonard Tachner

Attorney for the Applicant(s) Registration No. 26,344

LT/if

(949) 752-8525 Telephone

(949) 955-2415 Telefax